	Case 5:09-cv-02085-RMW Docu	ment 38	Filed 11/10/09	Page 1 of 2
1				
2				
3				
4	*E-FILED - 11/10/09*			
5	<u>*E-F1LED - 11/10/09 *</u>			
6				
7				
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10	TOR THE TORTHER VERSION OF CHEM OR VIII			
11	MICHAEL ANGELO LENA,)	N	o. C 09-2085 RM	W (PR)
12	Petitioner,	O	RDER DENYING	G REOUEST
13	v.)	FO	OR CERTIFICAT PPEALABILITY	TE OF
14 15	SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,) MOTION TO PROCEED IN) FORMA PAUPERIS WITHOUT) PREJUDICE		
16	Respondents.		Oocket No. 35)	
17		•	,	
18	Petitioner, a Canadian prisoner proceeding pro se, filed a petition for writ of habeas			
19	corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 alleging violations of his due process rights, among other			
20	things. On August 25, 2009, the court dismissed this action on abstention grounds,			
21	acknowledging that petitioner is incarcerated in Canada and raises claims arising from a pending			
22	criminal case in Marin County, California. Petitioner filed a timely notice of appeal.			
23	Upon the filing of a notice of appeal and a request for a certificate of appealability			
24	(COA), the district court shall indicate which specific issue or issues satisfy the standard for			
25	issuing a certificate, or state its reasons why a certificate should not be granted. See United			
26	States v. Asrar, 116 F.3d 1268, 1270 (9th Cir. 1997) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(3)).			
27	Although petitioner did not file a separate request for a certificate of appealability ("COA"), the			
28	Order Denying Request for Certificate of Appealability; Denying Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis Without Prejudice P:\PRO-SE\SJ.Rmw\HC.09\Lena085denCOA.wpd			

Case 5:09-cv-02085-RMW Document 38 Filed 11/10/09 Page 2 of 2

court construes his notice of appeal as such. See Asrar, 116 F.3d at 1270.

The court concludes that petitioner has not shown "that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling." <u>Slack v. McDaniel</u>, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). Accordingly, petitioner's request for a certificate of appealability is DENIED.

In view of the denial of the COA, petitioner's motion to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal will be denied without prejudice to renewing the motion in the Court of Appeal if it grants a COA.

The clerk shall serve notice of this order forthwith to the United States Court of Appeal and to the parties. <u>See</u> Fed. R. App. P. 24(a).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: <u>11/6/09</u>

Konald M. Whyte
RONALD M. WHYTE
United States District Judge

Order Denying Request for Certificate of Appealability; Denying Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis Without Prejudice

P:\PRO-SE\SJ.Rmw\HC.09\Lena085denCOA.wpd